

1
2
3 KUANG-BAO P. OU-YOUNG,
4 Plaintiff,

5 v.
6

7 JOHN G. ROBERTS, JR., Chief Justice,
8 Supreme Court of the United States, et al.,
9

10 Defendants.

11 Case No. 5:14-mc-80174-BLF

12
13 **ORDER DENYING LEAVE TO FILE
14 LAWSUIT**

15 Plaintiff Kuang-Bao P. Ou-Young has been declared a vexatious litigant; he must obtain
16 leave of court before “filing any further suits alleging any violations of the federal criminal
17 statutes, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1512(b), 18 U.S.C. § 1512 (c), and 18 U.S.C. § 371, and the
18 FTCA, codified at 28 U.S.C. § 2671 *et seq.*, involving parties that he named in” certain lawsuits
19 that he previously filed in this Court. (Order Granting United States’ Motion to Dismiss and
Declaring Plaintiff a Vexatious Litigant (“Vexatious Litigant Order”), ECF 40 in Case No. 3:13-
cv-04442-EMC)

20 Plaintiff has submitted for filing a new complaint that asserts 251 claims based upon
21 violations of the statutes identified above; the claims are asserted against defendants that Plaintiff
22 previously named as well as additional defendants. (Received Compl., ECF 1)

23 The proposed complaint does not allege any potentially cognizable claims. Plaintiff’s
24 claims against the defendants previously sued are barred by the Vexatious Litigant Order, which
25 ordered that those claims were “dismissed with prejudice and without leave to amend.”

26 Plaintiff’s claims against the additional defendants are dismissed *sua sponte* under Federal
27 Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b). *See Omar v. Sea-Land Service, Inc.*, 813 F.2d 986, 991 (9th Cir.
28 1987) (“A trial court may dismiss a claim *sua sponte* under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). . . . Such a

1 dismissal may be made without notice where the claimant cannot possibly win relief.”) As
2 explained in the Vexatious Litigant Order, this Court lacks jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s claims
3 against judges, prosecutors, and court staff, because they are immune from suit. (*See Vexatious*
4 *Litigant Order* at 7-8) Moreover, the federal criminal statutes upon which Plaintiff relies do not
5 provide a private right of action. (*Id.* at 9) Finally, Plaintiff has failed to exhaust administrative
6 remedies with respect to any FTCA claims. (*Id.* at 10-11)

7 Because the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s claims and because
8 Plaintiff cannot state a claim for relief, Plaintiff is DENIED leave to file the proposed complaint.
9 The Clerk shall close the file.

10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11
12 Dated: July 8, 2014

13
14 
BETH LABSON FREEMAN
United States District Judge